



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/823,542	03/30/2001	Pedro Costa Pereira	34073-PCT-USA-A-070337.02	8131

7590

06/24/2002

BAKER BOTTS LLP
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
44TH FLOOR
NEW YORK, NY 10112-4498

EXAMINER

JOHNSTONE, ADRIENNE C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1733

DATE MAILED: 06/24/2002

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Applicati n N .

09/823,542

Applicant(s)

PEREIRA ET AL.

Examiner

Adrienne C. Johnstone

Art Unit

1733

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondenc address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 March 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 March 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3. 6) ☐ Other: _____

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims withdrawn from consideration are 2, 3, 4/2-3, 5/2, 6-8/5/2, 9/8/5/2, 10/5/2, 11-13/10/5/2, 14-16/5/2, 17/15/5/2, 18/17/15/5/2, 19/15/5/2, and 20-22/5/2.

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims rejected are 1, 4/1, 5/1, 6-8/5/1, 9/8/5/1, 10/5/1, 11-13/10/5/1, 14-16/5/1, 17/15/5/1, 18/17/15/5/1, 19/15/5/1, and 20-22/5/1.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: a tire wherein the at least two decoupling rubber layers are between and contacting the cords of either two superposed belt reinforcing plies (Figure 1) or a belt reinforcing ply and an adjacent carcass reinforcing ply (Figure 5)(specification paragraphs 0014 and 0026).

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, no claim is generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Art Unit: 1733

2. During a telephone conversation with Richard Berkley on June 6, 2002 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of the species wherein the at least two decoupling rubber layers are between and contacting the cords of the two superposed belt reinforcing plies, claims 1, 4/1, 5/1, 6-8/5/1, 9/8/5/1, 10/5/1, 11-13/10/5/1, 14-16/5/1, 17/15/5/1, 18/17/15/5/1, 19/15/5/1, and 20-22/5/1. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 2, 3, 4/2-3, 5/2, 6-8/5/2, 9/8/5/2, 10/5/2, 11-13/10/5/2, 14-16/5/2, 17/15/5/2, 18/17/15/5/2, 19/15/5/2, and 20-22/5/2 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

3. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Priority

4. Applicant has not complied with one or more conditions for receiving the benefit of an earlier filing date under 35 U.S.C. 120 as follows:

This application is claiming the benefit of a prior filed nonprovisional application under 35 U.S.C. 120, 121, or 365(c). Copendency between the current application and the prior application is required.

Specifically, the filing date of this application is just under 30 months from the foreign priority date and there is no evidence in the file that parent PCT/EP99/07263 designated the US and that Chapter II was requested in order to maintain pendency of the parent 30 months from the priority date.

Art Unit: 1733

5. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Specification

6. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The following title is suggested: TIRE CROWN REINFORCEMENT WITH SPECIFIED RUBBER DECOUPLING LAYERS.

7. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: a scanning error has improperly replaced the Greek letters in paragraphs 0013 and 0046 with other symbols (see the priority document p. 3 lines 5-12 and p. 9 lines 23-24), in paragraph 0013 line 4 stress has been improperly recited as "strain", the abbreviation of tangent in paragraphs 0013 and 0046 is improperly recited "tg" (should be -- tan --), and the upper limit of the moduli ratio in paragraph 0031 is improperly recited as "0.08" (should be -- 0.8 --).

Appropriate correction is required.

8. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: the subject matter of claim 22 is not yet recited in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

9. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

10. Claims 6-8/5/1 and 9/8/5/1 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the best mode contemplated by the inventor has not been disclosed. Evidence of concealment of the best mode is based upon the contradictory preferred ranges for the ratio between the moduli of

Art Unit 1733

elasticity of the second rubber decoupling layer and the first layer: in the specification paragraph 0018 the preferred range is 0.4 to 0.6, but in the specification paragraph 0031 the preferred range is 0.5 to 0.7.

Since original claim 7 recites the 0.5 to 0.7 range, one way to overcome this rejection would be to clarify on the record that the 0.5 to 0.7 range is the preferred embodiment by changing the "between 0.4 and 0.6" in paragraph 0018 to -- between 0.5 and 0.7 -- .

11. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

12. Claims 1, 4/1, 5/1, 6-8/5/1, 9/8/5/1, 10/5/1, 11-13/10/5/1, 14-16/5/1, 17/15/5/1, 18/17/15/5/1, 19/15/5/1, and 20-22/5/1 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

To provide proper antecedent basis, to correctly recite the damping ratio as $\tan \delta$, to clarify that the damping ratio is measured as in the specification (paragraph 0013), and to clarify that the axial extent of the additional circumferential cord ply is not required to be exactly the same as that of the second rubber decoupling layer, applicants should make the following amendments to the claims.

claim 1

line 3, change "at least two" to -- two -- (this does not exclude the presence of more than two of the superposed reinforcing belt plies).

claim 8

line 2, change " $\text{tg } \alpha$ " to -- $\tan \delta$ -- .

Art Unit 1733

claim 9

line 2, change “tg α ” to -- tan δ -- and after “0.08” insert -- measured at a frequency of 10 Hz, a temperature of 60°C and at a peak-to-peak dynamic deformation of 10% -- .

claim 10

line 4, before “like” insert -- roughly -- (specification paragraph 0021).

claim 17

line 2, change “tg α ” to -- tan δ -- .

claim 18

line 2, change “tg α ” to -- tan δ -- and after “0.08” insert -- measured at a frequency of 10 Hz, a temperature of 60°C and at a peak-to-peak dynamic deformation of 10% -- .

claim 20

line 2, change “crown” to -- belt -- .

claim 21

lines 2 and 4, change “crown” to -- belt -- .

claim 22

rewrite as --

22. (amended) A tire according to Claim 5, in which [the said second layers extend] each second rubber decoupling layer extends axially more than 3 mm beyond the lateral ends of the cords of said [crown] two superposed belt reinforcing plies.

-- .

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 1733

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

15. Claims 1, 4/1, 5/1, 6-8/5/1, 10/5/1, 11-13/10/5/1, 14/5/1, and 20-22/5/1 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koyama et al. (4,140,166) in view of Cuthbertson et al. (2,541,506) or, alternatively, over Cuthbertson et al. (2,541,506) in view of Koyama et al. (4,140,166).

Koyama et al. disclose a tire similar to applicants' but wherein the two axially adjacent belt ply coating rubbers of different modulus of elasticity are not disclosed as contacting the cords of two adjacent belt plies (col. 1 line 35 - col. 5 line 22). Cuthbertson et al. teach to provide the belt ply coating rubber layers contacting the cords such that the belt cords are exposed to the adjacent rubber layer on the outer side and to its own coating rubber layer on the inner side in order to eliminate trapped air between the tread and adjacent belt plies (col. 1 line 1 - col. 3 line 28, Figures 1-2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the Koyama et al. tire with the belt ply coating rubber arrangement taught by Cuthbertson et al. in order to eliminate trapped air between the tread and adjacent belt plies.

Art Unit 1733

As to claims 6 and 7, the ratio between the first modulus and the second modulus is 35/72-0.5 in invention tire 1, 35/67-0.5 in reference tire 2, 43/64-0.7 in reference tire 1, 43/65-0.7 in reference tire 3, 35/62-0.6 in reference tire 4, and 35/75-0.5 in invention tire 2.

As to claim 8, the close correspondence of the modulus ratios of the above tire and the claimed tire provide sufficient basis for inferring that the $\tan \delta$ ratio of the above tire would also meet the claimed limitation of less than 1 (second rubber decoupling layer $\tan \delta$ less than that of the first layer).

As to claims 10-13, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide such conventional circumferentially oriented cord plies covering the belt ply axial edges in the above tire.

As to claim 14, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide such conventional H/W aspect ratio for the above tire.

As to the absolute value measurements of the zone of contact between the smaller-width belt ply and the second rubber decoupling layer in claims 20 and 21, there is no limitation on the size of the Koyama et al. tires and therefore the larger size tires would necessarily meet the claimed broad ranges of greater than 5 mm and greater than 20 mm (absolute values mean little without specifying the size of the tire, such as requiring the tire to be a passenger car tire as in the examples in the specification); as to the relative measurement of the zone of contact between the smaller-width belt ply and the second rubber decoupling layer in claim 21, axial half-width $a/2$ of the first modulus zone is 85% to 95% of the axial half-width $c/2$ of the ply, with an exemplary value of 88%, so the axial width of each second modulus zone is 5% to 15% of the axial half-width $c/2$ of the ply, with an exemplary value of 12%.

As to the absolute value measurement of the axial extent of each second rubber decoupling layer in claim 22, there is no limitation on the size of the Koyama et al. tires and therefore the

Art Unit: 1733

larger size tires would necessarily meet the claimed broad range of greater than 3 mm (absolute values mean little without specifying the size of the tire, such as requiring the tire to be a passenger car tire as in the examples in the specification).

Alternatively, Cuthbertson et al. disclose a tire similar to applicants' but without the rubber layers under the belt cords having a second modulus at the axial edges less than a first modulus in the center (col. 1 line 1 - col. 3 line 28, Figures 1-2); however, Koyama et al. teach to set the coating rubber modulus such that axial edge zones have a lower modulus than that of the center zone in order to prevent belt edge separation (col. 1 line 35 - col. 5 line 22). It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the rubber layers under the belt cords in the Cuthbertson et al. tire with the modulus gradient taught by Koyama et al. in order to prevent belt edge separation.

As to claims 6 and 7, the ratio between the first modulus and the second modulus is $35/72=0.5$ in invention tire 1, $35/67=0.5$ in reference tire 2, $43/64=0.7$ in reference tire 1, $43/65=0.7$ in reference tire 3, $35/62=0.6$ in reference tire 4, and $35/75=0.5$ in invention tire 2.

As to claim 8, the close correspondence of the modulus ratios of the above tire and the claimed tire provide sufficient basis for inferring that the $\tan \delta$ ratio of the above tire would also meet the claimed limitation of less than 1 (second rubber decoupling layer $\tan \delta$ less than that of the first layer).

As to claims 10-13, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide such conventional circumferentially oriented cord plies covering the belt ply axial edges in the above tire.

As to claim 14, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide such conventional H/W aspect ratio for the above tire.

Art Unit: 1733

As to the absolute value measurements of the zone of contact between the smaller-width belt ply and the second rubber decoupling layer in claims 20 and 21, there is no limitation on the size of the Cuthbertson et al. tires and therefore the larger size tires would necessarily meet the claimed broad ranges of greater than 5 mm and greater than 20 mm (absolute values mean little without specifying the size of the tire, such as requiring the tire to be a passenger car tire as in the examples in the specification); as to the relative measurement of the zone of contact between the smaller-width belt ply and the second rubber decoupling layer in claim 21, axial half-width $a/2$ of the first modulus zone is 85% to 95% of the axial half-width $c/2$ of the ply, with an exemplary value of 88%, so the axial width of each second modulus zone is 5% to 15% of the axial half-width $c/2$ of the ply, with an exemplary value of 12%.

As to the absolute value measurement of the axial extent of each second rubber decoupling layer in claim 22, there is no limitation on the size of the Cuthbertson et al. tires and therefore the larger size tires would necessarily meet the claimed broad range of greater than 3 mm (absolute values mean little without specifying the size of the tire, such as requiring the tire to be a passenger car tire as in the examples in the specification).

16. Claim 9/8/5/1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koyama et al. (4,140,166) in view of Cuthbertson et al. (2,541,506) or, alternatively, over Cuthbertson et al. (2,541,506) in view of Koyama et al. (4,140,166), as applied to claims 1, 4/1, 5/1, 6-8/5/1, 10/5/1, 11-13/10/5/1, 14/5/1, and 20-22/5/1 above, and further in view of Mechanics of Pneumatic Tires.

It is well known to minimize the damping ratio $\tan \delta$ (energy loss) in tire rubber compounds in order to minimize heat generation when the tire is in service, as evidenced by Mechanics of Pneumatic Tires (p. 27) for example. It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to minimize the damping ratio $\tan \delta$ of each second rubber decoupling

Art Unit: 1733

layer in the above tire, within applicants' broad range of less than 0.08, in order to minimize heat generation of the tire.

Double Patenting

17. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

18. Claims 1, 4/1, 5/1, 6-8/5/1, 10/5/1, 11-13/10/5/1, 14/5/1, and 20-22/5/1 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 3, 7, 8, 11, and 15 of copending Application No. 09/823,543. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 1 and 5/1 of this application are generic to claim 3 of 09/823,543.

As to claim 4, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide such conventional spirally wound structure in the first and second rubber bonding layers in claim 3 of 09/823,543.

As to claims 6-8, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the features of claims 3 and 11 of 09/823,543 and the close correspondence of the modulus ratios of the 09/823,543 tire and the claimed tire provide sufficient basis for inferring that the $\tan \delta$ ratio of the 09/823,543 tire would also meet the claimed limitation of less than 1 (second rubber decoupling layer $\tan \delta$ less than that of the first layer).

Art Unit: 1733

As to claims 10-13, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide such conventional circumferentially oriented cord plies covering the belt ply axial edges in the 09/823,543 tire.

As to claim 14, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide such conventional H/W aspect ratio for the 09/823,543 tire.

As to claims 20 and 21, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the features of claims 3, 7, and 8 of 09/823,543 and, since there is no limitation on the size of the Cuthbertson et al. tires, the larger size tires would necessarily meet the claimed broad ranges for the absolute value measurements of the zone of contact between the smaller-width belt ply and the second rubber decoupling layer in claims 20 and 21 of greater than 5 mm and greater than 20 mm (absolute values mean little without specifying the size of the tire, such as requiring the tire to be a passenger car tire as in the examples in the specification).

As to claim 22, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the features of claims 3 and 15 of 09/823,543.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

19. Claim 9 is provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 3 and 11 of copending Application No. 09/823,543 in view of Mechanics of Pneumatic Tires.

It is well known to minimize the damping ratio $\tan \delta$ (energy loss) in tire rubber compounds in order to minimize heat generation when the tire is in service, as evidenced by Mechanics of Pneumatic Tires (p. 27) for example. It would therefore have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the features of claims 3 and 11 of 09/823,543, the close correspondence of the modulus ratios of the 09/823,543 tire and the claimed tire providing

Art Unit 1733

sufficient basis for inferring that the $\tan \delta$ ratio of the 09/823,543 tire would also meet the claimed limitation of less than 1 (second rubber decoupling layer $\tan \delta$ less than that of the first layer) and to minimize the damping ratio $\tan \delta$ of each second rubber decoupling layer in the above tire, within applicants' broad range of less than 0.08, in order to minimize heat generation of the tire.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

20. Claims 15-19 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

21. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Adrienne C. Johnstone whose telephone number is (703)308-2059. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 10:00AM-6:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Ball can be reached on (703)308-2058. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)872-9311 for regular communications and (703)872-9310 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-0661.

Adrienne Johnstone
June 19, 2002

Adrienne C. Johnstone
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1733

